

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/036,825	11/08/2001	Jerome C. Bertrand	CW-06562	6104
7590 07/01/2004		EXAMINER		
Christine A. Lckutis			TOOMER, CEPHIA D	
MELDEN & CARROLL, LLP Suite 350			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
101 Howard Street			1714	
San Francisco, CA 94105			DATE MAILED: 07/01/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

S		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/036,825	BERTRAND ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Cephia D. Toomer	1714				
The MAILING DA Period for Reply	NTE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence address				
THE MAILING DATE C - Extensions of time may be avarafter SIX (6) MONTHS from the lift the period for reply specified If NO period for reply is specified. Failure to reply within the set of the set	F THIS COMMUNICATION. iilable under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 e mailing date of this communication. above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply ed above, the maximum statutory period w or extended period for reply will, by statute, te later than three months after the mailing	IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tire within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE date of this communication, even if timely filed	nely filed /s will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1) Responsive to co	ommunication(s) filed on 16 Ja	nuarv 2004.					
· ·	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
<i>'</i> —							
•	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4a) Of the above 5)	Claim(s) 1,3-10,12-28 and 34 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1,3-10,12-28 and 34 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification	is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) The drawing(s) file) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• •	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se					
•	_	ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob aminer. Note the attached Office					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119						
a) All b) Som 1. Certified co 2. Certified co 3. Copies of to application	e * c) None of: opies of the priority documents opies of the priority documents the certified copies of the prior from the International Bureau	s have been received in Applicat ity documents have been receiv	ion No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited		4) Interview Summary					
	atent Drawing Review (PTO-948) tement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) —·	Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/036,825 Page 2

Art Unit: 1714

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

- 1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 16, 2004 has been entered.
- 2. This Office action is in response to the amendment filed April 7, 2004 in which claims 1, 12-16, 18-28 and 34 were amended.
- 3. The rejection of the claims under 35 USC 112, first paragraph is withdrawn in view of Applicant's arguments.
- 4. The rejection of the claims as anticipated by Pungs '814 in view of Egan is withdrawn in view of the amendment to the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 12-19 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pungs (US 1,950,814).

Application/Control Number: 10/036,825

Art Unit: 1714

Pungs teaches a candle composition comprising saturated free fatty alcohols that are prepared from montan or vegetable waxes. The alcohols have 14 or more carbon atoms and a melting point above 45 °C. The alcohol is present in the candle composition in an amount from 1.5 to 20% (see lines 1-54). The candle base material may be paraffin wax, stearine, stearic acid or synthetic fatty acids and mixtures thereof (see lines 55-68). Pungs teaches that the candles have non-smoky flames (see lines 84-88). Pungs teaches the limitations of the claims other than the differences that are discussed below.

Pungs fails to teach the claimed lodine value; however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have prepared a composition possessing the claimed lodine value because Pungs teaches a composition comprising no unsaturated compounds, i.e., a mixture of saturated alcohols, paraffin wax and stearic acid. Given that there is no unsaturated compounds present in Pungs, it would be reasonable to expect that the composition would meet the lodine value limitations set forth in the claims, absent evidence to the contrary.

7. Claims 1, 3-10, 12-16, 23-28 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pungs (US 1,950,813).

Pungs '813 teaches candle compositions comprising combustible fatty substances such as beeswax, paraffin wax and stearic acid and the composition contains 25-50 percent saturated aliphatic alcohols derived from vegetable waxes. Such alcohols include octadecyl alcohol (C₁₈) (see lines 1-15, 38-42 and 51-57). Pungs '813 teaches that the candle may consist entirely of the alcohols 9see lines 48-51).

Application/Control Number: 10/036,825

Art Unit: 1714

Example 2 contains 25-part alcohol, 60 parts paraffin wax and 15 parts stearine.

Example 3 contains a composition comprising 30 parts fatty alcohol and 70 parts wax. The composition melts at a temperature of 90 °C. While Example 3 does not contain a wick, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a wick in

the candle composition, because Pungs '813 teaches that the alcohols are readily

absorbed by the wicks (see lines 66-70).

Pungs '813 fails to teach the claimed lodine value; however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have prepared a composition possessing the claimed lodine value because Pungs teaches a composition comprising no unsaturated compounds, i.e., a mixture of saturated alcohols, paraffin wax and stearic acid. Given that there is no unsaturated compounds present in Pungs, it would be reasonable to expect that the composition would meet the lodine value limitations set forth in the claims, absent evidence to the contrary.

8. Claims 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pungs '813 as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Egan (US 1,935,946).

Pungs '813 has been discussed above. Pungs '813 fails to teach hydrogenated free fatty acids. However, Egan teaches this difference.

Egan teaches a candle composition wherein natural oils are hydrogenated to an IV of 5 or less and he separates the free fatty acids from the oil (see lines 1-15, 33-54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have substituted hydrogenated stearic acid for the stearic acid of Pungs '813 because Egan teaches that hydrogenated stearic acid allows the candle maker to use less of the expensive refined

Application/Control Number: 10/036,825

Art Unit: 1714

paraffin wax (see lines 28-41) and because he teaches that the acids are art recognized equivalents.

9. Applicant's declaration has been considered but is not deemed sufficient to overcome the present prior art rejections. Applicant's arguments are not supported by data, but are mere statements of what Applicant believes to be true.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cephia D. Toomer whose telephone number is 571-272-1126. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on 571-272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1714

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cephia D. Toomer Primary Examiner Art Unit 1714

10036825\062604